necessarily keep the President from spending dollars that are presently in the 1999 accounts; and so I want to apologize to the gentleman for misconstruing his amendment and saying that it would immediately paralyze all air operations. It would not stop for 4 months.

I still oppose the gentleman's amendment, but I do want to let him know that that statement was in error.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MANZULLO).

Mr. MANZULLO. Mr. Chairman, as my colleagues know, NATO is the alter ego of the United States. Whatever NATO does, it means the United States does, and what have we done?

Milosevic is still in power, close to 200 schools in Serbia have been destroyed, a half-dozen bridges across the Danube, power plants. We have destroyed a country. We have wasted our precious military resources. The American people have been asked to pay not only for the war, but the President will come back and ask us to rebuild Serbia. It is wrong. It is fiscally wrong and it is morally wrong.

The President needs to be stopped in this unwanted use of taxpayers' dollars. That is the purpose of the Souder amendment, to bring some sanity to what is going on in the world. This war never should have been started, and the American taxpayers should not be called upon to complete it.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. GEJDEN-SON)

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. HASTINGS of Washington). The gentleman from Connecticut is recognized for 2½ minutes.

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. Skelton) and the gentleman from California (Mr. Hunter) for coming together in opposition to this amendment.

The logic, at this point, as we have begun a process which ends the horror and extermination that was going on in Kosovo, to suddenly believe that we can crawl into some isolationist shell just does not make sense. The President and the Secretary of State, Sandy Berger, and the Secretary of Defense have done a spectacular job. They have kept NATO united, and frankly, as we are skeptics by nature in this Congress, I was skeptical that we could keep NATO united. They were successful in an air campaign, and so many experts told us we could not be successful with just an air campaign.

To come to the floor today and blame us for the devastation wrought on the Serbs would be akin to blaming the allies for the bombing that occurred on Germany in World War II. We have a responsibility in this Congress. It is to critically examine the actions of the executive

But what I am fearful of here is that the hostility to this administration

carries over in legislative attempts that defy America's basic national interest. Whether one believes the campaign could work or not, whether one believes we ought to have been there or not, at this stage to argue that America should simply remove itself is unacceptable and unwise for America's national interest.

□ 1415

America, under this President's leadership with our Secretary of State and their foreign policy team, has gotten an agreement for the smallest percentage of American participation in any action since the end of World War II that I can remember, less than 15 percent, a little over 7,000 of the troops. Our other NATO allies are taking a substantial portion, as they should, because it is Europe. That never happened before.

We should be in the well congratulating our military and our political leadership for having stood up to a tyrant and stopped the killing. Yes, there was a price paid, a price paid on civilians on both sides, but no one has any right to criticize our response in fighting for the lives of men and women being raped and murdered, being taken from their homes.

Was America to sit by and build one more monument? I have said this before. I have seen virtually every one of our colleagues at ceremonies for the Holocaust and Armenian genocide. This time we acted. We did not wait afterwards to wring our hands. I support the efforts of the chairman and the ranking Democrat to defeat this amendment.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. HASTINGS of Washington). The gentleman from Indiana is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Chairman, a couple of points: One is I do not think it is helpful to take really serious deep disagreements about the validity of this particular war and imply that it has a political motive. I think I can stand here with the respect of this House and say I am not obsessed with removing this President or blaming everything on this President. I have deep reservations and opposition, not only to the war, but what we are potentially going to get into in destabilization in the peacekeeping force, not because horror is not terrible, just like in Sudan and many other places around the world, but I fear greater consequences in the other places in national interest.

Let me make clear again, this is the hardest core amendment. The amendment of the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPENCE) is more moderate. If the Skelton amendment passes to the Spence amendment, the House will have no way to vote for those of us who oppose this war because the Skelton amendment would gut the Spence amendment.

whether some of the supplemental funds would be affected. In my opinion, and I believe in most people's opinion, it would allow the funds to be expended for the rest of this year. We would have four months to make whatever transfer over of a European problem to the Europeans in the case of funding the peacekeepers after this.

If one does not favor the extended intervention in the Balkans through whatever, whether it is peacekeeping or in fact a continuation of the war or an Iraq-type situation, this amendment gives one the ability to say in the fiscal year 2000 funds, after October 1 and for that year, unless the President comes to this House and says, "This is an emergency, I need to waive what you previously passed, I need additional money," but it restricts the funding we are now putting out and have put out for fiscal year 2000 and says you cannot use that, yes, not only for air war and ground war, but you cannot use it for the peacekeepers either.

I do not expect a lot of support for this amendment, but for those of us who have deep concerns, this is our chance to cast that vote.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER).

The question was taken; and the Chairman pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 97, noes 328, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 187] AYES—97

Goodling Aderholt Peterson (MN) Archer Graham Petri Bachus Hall (TX) Pitts Hastings (WA) Baker Pombo Hayes Radanovich Bartlett Havworth Ramstad Bilbray Hefley Rogan Bilirakis Herger Rohrabacher Bonilla Brady (TX) Hill (MT) Ros-Lehtinen Hoekstra Royce Salmon Bryant Horn Burton Hostettler Sanford Campbell Hulshof Scarborough Istook Schaffer Canady Cannon Jenkins. Sensenbrenner Chabot Jones (NC) Sessions Shadegg Chenoweth Kasich Coble Kingston Shays Shuster Kucinich Collins LaHood Souder Combest Largent Stump Lewis (KY) Cook Sununu Crane LoBiondo Tancredo Lucas (OK) Cubin Tauzin Taylor (NC) Danner Manzullo McKinney Terry DeMint Doolittle Metcalf Vitter Wamp Mica Miller, Gary Ewing Watkins Watts (OK) Ganske Myrick Nethercutt Weldon (FL) Gibbons Goode Paul Goodlatte Pease

NOES-328

Abercrombie Andrews Baldacci Ackerman Armey Baldwin Allen Baird Ballenger